

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/718,923	11/21/2003	Feng-wei Chen Russell	RSW920030185US1	2402		
45541 HOFFMAN W	7590 04/17/200 ARNICK & DALESS	EXAM	EXAMINER			
75 STATE ST			BETTT,	BETTT, JACOB F		
14TH FLOOR Albany, ny 12207			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2164			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			04/17/2008	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/718,923	RUSSELL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jacob F. Betit	2164	

	Jacob F. Betit	2164					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 24 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, application, application and the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	<del>-</del>						
b) \(\sum \) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. If no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: (If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(	f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
	diance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	of the date of				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS	bt prior to the data of Elips a brief	ill not be entered be					
3. \( \sum \) The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) \( \sum \) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);						
(c) 🔀 They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for							
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reig	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).				
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>							
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided.</li> </ol>		I be entered and an e	xplanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Charles Rones/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

## Continuation of 3 NOTE:

While the limitations that were added to claims 7, 14, and 20 appear all to be adaptations of limitations that were found in claim 9 previously, allowing entry of this amendment would be improper. With regards to adding the limitations to claim 7, the added limitations would claim dependencies requiring further consideration and/or search. With regards to adding the limitations to claim 14 and 20, these added limitations were never considered in these embodiments and would also require further consideration and / or search.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In response to the applicant's arguments that 'the cited art ... does not teach or suggest ... selecting a business taxonomy, selecting a business problem' the business trachem based on the business problem" the arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive. Vishnubhotla clearly teaches these limitations. Selecting a business taxonomy is the same as "simplifying the use of data mining analytic applications" by making them "domain" or "problem subject area" specific. See paragraph 0012. A business problem is then selected based on the "domain". "For a specific domain, it is typical use of embodiments of the present invention to identify business problems that are applicable to such a specific domain," it is pipical use of embodiments of the present invention to identify business problems that are applicable to such a specific domain. "See paragraph 0013. Data mining algorithms are then selected based on the business problem." In flytical embodiments ... the steps of defining business problems, preselecting mining algorithms, predefining data schema, and predefining data mining models are done by the analytic application developer." See paragraph 0014.

In response to the applicant's arguments that "it is unfathomable how the Office can maintain its contention that there is motivation or suggestion in the references themselves or elsewhere to combine such diverse references," the arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive. The applicant fails to point out exactly how the motivation found in the previous action fails and is merely making a broad statement without backing it up with any evidence. Further the applicant is directed to the remarks made in section III. in the Response to Arguments section of the previous action.